of those names is in conflict with current practice. I think that it is logical, even if not strictly laid down in the Code, to extend that principle to cases where the replacement name cannot be used because it is a junior homonym or junior synonym. I find no evidence that Article 59b(i) applies only to names of economic or other importance.

I think that if, as a result of nomenclatural (not taxonomic) confusion, two or more names are used for the same species, the nomenclatural validation of one of those names (preferably the oldest and most used) serves stability better than the introduction of a further name that has never come into use for the species.

Capsus and *Deraeocoris* are placed in different, generally accepted, subfamilies. The possible future taxonomic changes referred to by Dr Holthuis are rather theoretical and in my judgment their nomenclatural interpretation is covered by Articles 57 and 59c. I think (and Mr Melville is of the same opinion) that the nomenclatural validation of junior secondary homonyms under Article 59c(i) implies only the rejection of the replacement name proposed before 1961, and not the taxonomic validation of the name. But to avoid any doubts it will be best to modify my proposals as follows:

The Commission is now asked

(1) to use its plenary powers:
  (a) to rule that the specific name *ater* Jakovlev, 1889, as published in the binomen *Capsus ater*, is not to be rejected as a junior homonym of the specific name *ater* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Cimex ater*, by any zoologist who places those species in different genera;
  (b) to suppress the specific name *quadripunctatus* Villers, 1789, as published in the binomen *Cimex quadripunctatus*, for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy;
(2) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
  (a) *ater* Jakovlev, 1889, as published in the binomen *Capsus ater*, with an endorsement that it is not to be rejected as a junior homonym of *ater* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Cimex ater* by any zoologist who places those species in different genera;
  (b) *quadripunctatus* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Lygaeus quadripunctatus*;

(3) to place the specific name *quadripunctatus* Villers, 1789, as published in the binomen *Cimex quadripunctatus*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSAL TO DESIGNATE THE GENDER AND STEM OF *HELIOTHIS* OCHSENHEIMER, 1816 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA). Z.N.(S.) 2306

(see vol. 37, pp. 186–189)

By W. Reed (*International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics, Patancheru P.O., Andhra Pradesh 502324, India*)

[The following is an extract from a letter sent by Dr Reed to Dr Nye on 21 January 1982. R.V.M.]

'Your paper on the nomenclature of *Heliothis* was received with interest and appreciation by the International Workshop on *Heliothis* Management. Following its presentation by Dr J.C. Davies it was announced that all participants would be given two days to digest and discuss the contents before being asked to respond to the following referendum:

I support the retention of the established nomenclature for *H. armigera, H. peltigera, H. punctigera,* etc.

I support the suggested change in nomenclature to *H. armiger, H. peltiger, H. punctiger,* etc.

'Of 47 replies received, 45 were in favour of retaining *H. armigera,* etc.

'As this workshop was attended by many of the world's most experienced and active research specialists concentrating upon *Heliothis,* I think that there is little doubt about the preference for retention of the established nomenclature among the people who really matter. I hope that you will continue to press the Commission for the retention of the established names,'

SIMULIUM AMAZONICUM GOELDI, 1905 (DIPTERA): SUPPORTING COMMENT FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF SYNTYPES AND DESIGNATION OF A NEOTYPE. Z.N.(S.) 2364.

(see *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 67–70)

By R.W. Crosskey (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

In my view the Commission should in general react warily to requests for the suppression of extant primary types of species-group taxa — lest requests for original types to be suppressed in favour of neotypes should become the fashion whenever the original primary type for a name fails to show the ideal taxonomic characters or is inconvenient for some other reason.

That said, it is also my view that the Commission should not hesitate to exercise its powers to suppress the use of existing primary types, and to designate neotypes on application from specialists, whenever this can resolve nomenclatural problems concerning animals of direct and demonstrable importance to man, e.g. parasites, disease vectors, destructive pests.

Accordingly I fully endorse Dr Shelley's request for the suppression of the extant syntypes of *Simulium amazonicum* Goeldi and for designation by the Commission of the specimen that he recommends as neotype (his paragraph 9(1)(b)).

The *Simulium amazonicum* group of blackflies (SIMULIIDAE) is now known to contain several species that are actual or potential vectors of human filariases in South America. It is currently under intensive taxonomic study to determine accurately which species are involved in disease epidemiology, and which are therefore potential targets for vector control. The group is one of unusual taxonomic difficulty, intrinsically because of the close resemblances between species and extrinsically because of sampling problems for the preimaginal stages. Only morphotaxonomic characters are as yet available for species discrimination. *Simulium amazonicum* is the nomenclatural pivot of the group, but the name has been haphazardly applied (actually in almost all cases misapplied) to several different species that bite man in the Amazon basin and circumjacent areas.

The almost inextricably confused history of the name has been unravelled by Dr Shelley, who has recently also provided a comprehensive redescription of